



ERIC GIBSON
INTERIM DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

July 10, 2008

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF DEL DIOS HIGHWAY ROW WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY P06-072, ER 06-08-037

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

Del Dios Highway ROW Wireless Telecommunication Facility/P06-072/
ER 06-08-037
2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666
3.
 - a. Contact Merry Tondro, Project Manager
 - b. Phone number: (858) 694-3716
 - c. E-mail: Merry.Tondro@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:

Del Dios Highway, 8901 Del Dios Highway, CA 92067 (APN 678-021-03)
Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1149 C/7
5. Project Applicant name and address:

Karen Adler
Plancom, Inc.
302 State Place
Escondido, CA 92029
6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: San Dieguito
Land Use Designation: (21) Specific Plan Area
Density: N/A

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: S80 Open Space
Minimum Lot Size: N/A
Special Area Regulation: N/A

8. Description of project:

The project is a Major Use Permit to construct and operate an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility. The project consists of the installation two antennas mounted on a proposed 40 foot tall steel utility pole painted brown to match nearby wood utility poles. Associated project elements include the installation of a 17'2"x6'2" underground concrete equipment vault. Excavation for the vault would involve 81.5 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 13.5 cy of fill, export of 68 cy of soil, and an excavation depth of 12 feet. The underground equipment vault would contain equipment racks, two battery racks, a surge suppressor, and other equipment. Approximately 750 feet of trenching would occur along the Del Dios Highway right-of-way (ROW) for the connection of power to the equipment vault.

The project is located within the Del Dios Highway ROW in the San Dieguito Community Planning Group, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Estate Development Area (EDA), Land Use Designation (21) Specific Plan Area. Zoning for the site is S80 (Open Space).

Approximately two vehicle trips per month would be made for routine maintenance of the facility. Access to the site would be provided by an access road connecting to Del Dios Highway.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Lands surrounding the project site are vacant and characterized by dense vegetation and steep hills. The site is located along Del Dios Highway ROW in the San Dieguito Community Planning Group. The Del Dios Highway ROW in this location supports drainage facilities, utility poles, and telephone lines.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Major Use Permit	County of San Diego

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or a “Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Haz. Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Merry Tondro

Printed Name

Date

Land Use/Environmental Planner

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation. Generally, the viewshed from a highway includes the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way and extends the distance of a motorist's line of vision, using a reasonable boundary when the view extends to the distant horizon. Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

Based on photographs of the subject parcel and photosimulations provided by the applicant, the proposed project is not visible from a scenic vista, a County priority scenic route, or a State Scenic Highway; therefore, the project would not have an adverse impact on these visual resources. Furthermore, the proposed project would not have an adverse affect on the existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be characterized as vacant open space with substantial mature vegetation and surrounding hills. The majority of the proposed wireless telecommunications facility would not be visible, as all support equipment would be located underground. The remaining project elements, including the proposed 40-foot steel pole and two antennas, would be painted brown to match the color of wood utility poles located in the immediate vicinity of the project site, also along the Del Dios Highway ROW. Therefore, the steel pole and antennas would not be out of character with existing uses found adjacent to the highway. As the majority of the facility would be out of view and the remaining project elements would employ harmonizing design

features, the proposed facility would not be inconsistent with the area's existing visual character and quality.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts to scenic resources within a scenic vista, a County priority scenic route, or a State Scenic Highway because the project is not located within the viewshed of any of these resources.

b) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project would not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass or glare, nor would the project adversely affect day or nighttime views.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and the surrounding area do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located in an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM₁₀ and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. Emissions associated with the project include very limited emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities and trips to and from the facility. The limited scale of construction and the limited vehicle trips (two per month) associated with the project would not constitute a significant air quality impact. Furthermore, any grading in excess of 200 cubic yards is subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures.

According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM₁₀. Also, the project does not include any elements that would cause objectionable odors. Finally, the project would not result in exposure of significant pollutant

concentrations to sensitive receptors because the project would not produce significant pollutant concentrations. Therefore, the impact to air quality is less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service; have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; or interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Biological resources on the project site were evaluated and summarized in a Biological Resources Report prepared by Merkel and Associates dated June 18, 2008. The proposed wireless facility is located along the northern boundary of the parcel line within the Del Dios Highway right-of-way. The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would impact 0.10-acre of coastal sage scrub. The proposed wireless facility consists of 2 antennas constructed on a 40-foot tall steel utility pole and excavation of an approximate 6-foot by 17-foot underground vault to serve as the equipment shelter. An electrical conduit trench would be placed adjacent to the existing guardrail along Del Dios Highway for approximately 750 feet in order to connect to an appropriate electrical source. Existing resources located within the study area (100 feet surrounding the project area) are 1.26 acres of southern coast live oak riparian forest, 0.03-acre of coast live oak woodland, 2.27 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including 1.94 acres of disturbed quality Diegan coastal sage scrub), 0.63-acre of non-native vegetation, 0.42-acre of disturbed habitat, and 0.85-acre of urban/developed. Two sensitive plants and no sensitive wildlife species were observed within the study area and are as follows: California adolphia (*Adolphia californica*) and spiny rush (*Juncus acutus* ssp. *leopoldii*). Since this project is located along the Del Dios Highway right-of-way, minimal impacts are proposed within the study area. Approximately 0.10-acre of coastal sage scrub considered to be disturbed in quality would be impacted from the installation of this

proposed wireless facility. No sensitive plant species would be impacted as a result of this project.

The subject project is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Hardline Preserve Land, immediately adjacent to Take Authorized Land located along Del Dios Highway proper. US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) concurred that the proposed wireless facility would be allowed on this specific location within the MSCP Hardline Preserve Land because it is located along the Del Dios Highway right-of-way. In addition, the project would result in minimal impacts to 0.10-acre of coastal sage scrub habitat that would be mitigated at two times the required 1.5:1 ratio to account for the loss of designated MSCP Hardline Preserved Land.

Therefore, the mitigation ratio would be 3:1, which would include approximately 0.30-acre of Tier II or higher Tier mitigation land located within the MSCP Subregional Planning Area. The proposed project impacts are considered to be a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA) because of its location in and adjacent to MSCP Hardline Preserve Land. Therefore, mitigation would also occur in BRCA land.

The project would not impact wetlands, defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through, discharging into, directly removing, filling, or hydrologically interrupting, any federally protected wetlands supported on the project site. The project would not impede the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species from using an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The site is surrounded by undeveloped lands and Del Dios Highway which may facilitate movement of native or migratory wildlife species and/or may support wildlife nursery sites. Although the site is located within Hardline Preserve Lands, the site is also immediately adjacent to Take Authorized Lands located along Del Dios Highway proper. Del Dios Highway is a major corridor for cars, trucks, and bicyclists but is not a good wildlife linkage or corridor. The proposed wireless facility would not hinder or encourage wildlife movement within this area because it is located along Del Dios Highway right-of-way which is not a good wildlife linkage or corridor and the area of impact is minimal. The proposed facility is a small-scale project and would not create a barrier to wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites. Rather, it would remain a passive part of the existing landscape.

Mitigation for project impacts include: the offsite purchase of coastal sage scrub, temporary fencing along the Hardline Preserve, a biological monitor, and avoidance of avian breeding season. All potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a level below significant. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations; to wetlands or waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; and would not impede the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- b) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The subject project is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Hardline Preserve Land immediately adjacent to Take Authorized Land located along Del Dios Highway proper. US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) concurred that the proposed wireless facility would be allowed on this specific location within the MSCP Hardline Preserve Land because it is located along the Del Dios Highway right-of-way. In addition, the project would result in minimal impacts to 0.10-acre of coastal sage scrub habitat that would be mitigated at two times the required 1.5:1 ratio to account for the loss of designated MSCP Hardline Preserved Land. Therefore, the mitigation ratio would be 3:1, which is equivalent to approximately 0.30-acre of Tier II or higher Tier mitigation land located within the MSCP Subregional Planning Area. The proposed project impacts are considered to be a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA) because of its location in and adjacent to MSCP Hardline Preserve Land. Therefore, mitigation would also occur in BRCA land.

Mitigation for project impacts include: the offsite purchase of coastal sage scrub, temporary fencing along the Hardline Preserve, a biological monitor, and avoidance of avian breeding season. All potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a level below significant. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5; cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5; or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Diane Shalom on June 11, 2008, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. The wireless site would be located along Del Dios Highway where there is no potential for historical resources. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

Based on the same analysis described above, it has been determined that the project site may contain archaeological resources. Archaeological sites CA-SDI-13,602 and CA-SDI-13,604 are located near the proposed project and may be impacted by construction and grading activities. Therefore, a pre-grading survey by a County approved consultant would be required to determine if the above sites are within the area of potential effect (APE). If the sites are within a close proximity to the APE, temporary fencing would be required to avoid impacts during grading. A grading monitoring program consisting of a County approved consultant and Native American representative would also be required during any ground disturbing activities. The pre-grading survey and implementation of a grading monitoring program would ensure that the known sites and any unknown buried sites would not be impacted by the proposed project. In addition, the project must comply with the San Diego County Grading, Clearing, and Watercourse Ordinance (§87.101-87.804), CEQA §15064.5(d), and §7050.5 of the Health & Safety Code. Section 87.429 of the Grading, Clearance, and Watercourse Ordinance requires the suspension of grading operations when human remains or Native American artifacts are encountered.

Finally, as outlined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(d), in the event that human remains are discovered during grading or construction of the project, the County will work with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The applicant may develop an agreement for treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any items associated with Native American burials with the appropriate Native Americans as identified by the NAHC.

b) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History, combined with available data on San Diego

County's geologic formations, indicates that the project is located on geological formations that have marginal resource potential. Marginal resource potential is assigned to geologic formations that are composed either of volcanic rocks or high-grade metasedimentary rocks, and have only limited probability for producing fossil remains from certain sedimentary lithologies at localized outcrops. Due to site's limited potential to support any fossil remains, the project would not result in the loss of significant paleontological information and the impact is less than significant.

Furthermore, the site does contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the impact to unique geologic features would be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS –

Would the project

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
 - ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv. Landslides?
 - v. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
 - vi. Unstable geological conditions?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. However, the Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classify all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. Although the project is within San Diego County, and thus, within the UBC and CBC Zone 4 seismic zone, the project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic groundshaking.

This is because the project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not involve habitable structures or significant construction of property. In addition, to ensure the structural integrity of the equipment shelter, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, as the facility would be unmanned and the equipment shelter would conform to CBC and County Code requirements, there would be a less than significant impact associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault or seismic groundshaking.

The site is located within a very low to marginal landslide susceptibility zone. Also, according to the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973, the soils on-site are identified as Riverwash (Rm) and San Miguel Exchequer rocky silt loams (SnG) that have a soil erodibility rating of severe and are not considered expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Therefore, impacts associated with landslides and seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils; would not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and would not develop steep slopes. Although the project would result in site disturbance associated with installation of the telecommunication pole, equipment vault and utility trenching, grading would result in total soil movement of less than 700 cubic yards and the project would be required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING), which regulate soil disturbance and restoration. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil, nor create unstable geologic conditions. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulative geologic or soils impact because all past, present and future projects evaluated for this initial study that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Stormwater Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Also, all past, present and future projects evaluated for this initial study that involve issuance of a building permit must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, the cumulative geologic and soils impact is less than significant.

Based on the above, potential geologic and soils impacts as they pertain to the criteria listed in question VI. a) are less than significant.

- b) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that does not include or require septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No wastewater would be generated as a result of this project; therefore, there is no impact.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes; through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; through the emission or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or because the site is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would include 8 GNB Marathon Batteries (M12V155), representing approximately 21 gallons of hazardous liquid. The batteries would be located within the proposed underground equipment vault to support the radio cabinets. However, the project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances would be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans, chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that all onsite hazardous materials storage will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project would not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances.

- b) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports, within two miles of a public airport, or within one mile of a private air strip. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or great than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and, as such, a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element would not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

Less Than Significant Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the project would include design attributes that minimize its physical footprint. They include an equipment vault located completely sub-grade and a narrow steel utility pole. In an emergency, the proposed facility would not impede implementation of the evacuation plan or present a physical barrier to evacuation. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

- d) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project has demonstrated compliance with County Policy FP2, Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities. The goal of the fire prevention standards in Policy FP2 are to make sure cellular sites are self protecting, with no fire agency emergency response anticipated, especially in major wildland incidents. This is accomplished primarily through construction with non-combustible exterior materials. The proposed project includes a non-combustible steel utility pole and an equipment vault that would be protected from fire due to its location underground. Based on compliance with the County Policy FP2, Fire Code Compliance for Cellular Facilities, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

- e) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facilities or other similar uses. Moreover, the project is an unmanned telecommunication facility that would not include new residents or occupants that could be exposed to existing vector sources.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility, which requires completion of a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) for Minor Projects to demonstrate compliance with all requirements of the County of San Diego Watershed Protection Ordinance. The Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), May 16, 2006 for the above-referenced project, was reviewed by the Department of Public Works and deemed complete. The project proposes minor grading, trenching and construction of the telecommunication facility and would be required to implement site design measures and source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff and receiving waters. Implementation of BMPs such as fiber rolls and sandbag barriers, as detailed in the SWMP for this project, would enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

The proposed BMPs identified in the project's SWMP for minor projects are consistent with regional surface water and stormwater planning and permitting processes that have been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an impaired water body, as listed by the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and stormwater permitting regulations for the County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and the San Diego Unified Port District include the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and, County Stormwater Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purpose of these ordinances is to protect the health, safety and general welfare of County of San Diego residents; protect water resources and improve water quality; cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; secure benefits from the use of stormwater as a resource; and ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions and requirements that vary depending on the type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to obtain permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for

projects so that water quality is not degraded from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and proposes BMPs or design measures to mitigate impacts that may occur in the watershed. As the proposed project would be required to implement the water quality protection measures contained in its Stormwater Management Plan, the impact would be less than significant.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact. The project proposes an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility. The project would implement construction BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff. These measures would control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-

Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) dated May 16, 2006 for the project outlines BMPs that address equipment operation, materials management, erosion and sedimentation in onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works would ensure that the SWMP is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, the project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and would not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation would be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI, Geology and Soils, Question b.

- d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project does not include nor require stormwater drainage systems. Furthermore, the project would not result in a significant increase in pervious surfaces that could contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Drainages, which are mapped on a FEMA floodplain map, a County Floodplain Map or have a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site. However, the project does not propose structures with a potential for human occupation within these areas nor would the project result in

structures or improvements that would limit access during flood events or affect downstream properties.

- f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: A 100-year flood hazard area is identified on the project site. However, the project would not construct habitable structures, access roads or other improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows in these areas.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam or from inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not attract people to the site. In addition, the project would not involve construction of structures that would be considered a significant loss if flooding or other inundation events occurred. Finally, the San Diego County of Disaster Preparedness has an established emergency evacuation plan in the case of flooding or dam failure for the area; the proposed project would not interfere with this plan.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: the project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that does not propose the introduction of major roadways, water supply systems, or other major infrastructure that could significantly disrupt or divide an established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Estate Development Area (EDA) and General Plan Land Use Designation (21) Specific Plan Area. The project is consistent with the General Plan because wireless telecommunication facilities are anticipated by the (21) Specific Plan Area Land Use Designation, which is open to all land use regulations.

The property is zoned S80 which permits wireless telecommunication facilities upon the issuance of a Major Use Permit pursuant to The Zoning Ordinance Section 6980. Although the Zoning Ordinance has a 35-foot height restriction, the project would be granted a specific exception pursuant to Section 4620(g) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow the telecommunication facility to be 40 feet tall. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state or to a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is a wireless telecommunication facility that would involve a limited area of construction. Due to its small size, any future use or availability of mineral resources would not be lost. Therefore, there is no impact to mineral resources.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise-sensitive areas. A proposed use that has the potential to expose noise-sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dB(A)) must have an acoustical study prepared. If the acoustical study finds that the proposed project would generate noise in excess of 60 dB(A) CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise-sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Section 36.404 of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance prohibits the one-hour average sound level at the boundary line of the property on which the sound is generated to exceed a pre-determined limit defined by the property's zone. The proposed project site is zoned S80. The most stringent one-hour average sound limit for Zone S80 is 45 dB(A).

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

The project would not generate construction noise that would exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, due to the small scale of construction required, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75 dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that does not support any noise-generating equipment such as an air conditioner or a backup

generator. Therefore, the project would not expose people to or generate any noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Furthermore, noise impacts resulting from the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable. The project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.410) ensures the project would not exceed noise standards for noise-sensitive areas, nor would the project exceed noise level limits at the property line or during construction. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways, or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent, temporary, or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level. The proposed project is a wireless telecommunication facility that would not result in an increase in noise levels by 10 decibels due to the limited noise producing equipment included as part of the project and based on anticipated compliance with County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance standards (refer to Question XI. a). Also, the project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

The project would not result in cumulative noise impacts as determined through an analysis of past, present and future projects within the vicinity. It was determined that the project, in combination past, present and future projects, would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the past, present and future projects considered within the proposed project vicinity.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or private airstrip. Therefore, there is no impact.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly; displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or

displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would have no effect on the availability of housing, nor displace housing or people. Furthermore, the project does not propose new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions. Therefore, the project would not induce substantial population growth by proposing a physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not result in the need for significantly altered public services or facilities. Correspondence from the Department of Planning and Land Use, Building Division confirmed that the project would meet fire code access, water supply and fuel modification requirements, thereby exceeding FP-2 requirements.

Furthermore, as an unmanned telecommunication facility, the project does not require the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, parks or other public service facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical affect on the environment due to new or significantly altered public services or facilities.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project:

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, such as a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction of a single-family residence. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities, and as discussed in XIV. a., would not result in the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there is no impact to recreation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would result in an additional two trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The proposed project generates two additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and would not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project would not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Also refer to the answer for XV. b. below.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project would result in an additional two trips per month. The project was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to exceed a level of service (LOS) standard at the direct project level for the following reasons: The proposed project generates two additional trips. Given the County's traffic thresholds (Table 1) 100 ADT on a road operating at LOS F and 200 ADT on a road operating at LOS E there would be no direct impacts to a road segment. Using SANDAG's estimate for AM and PM peak hour trips, the project would generate less than five peak hour trips and would not exceed the five additional trips to a critical move threshold - especially when the trips are distributed on the road network. Therefore, the project would not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

However, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates two trips per month. These trips would be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated county that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which is required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, would mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. The proposed project includes design attributes that would minimize its physical footprint and, therefore, its potential to become a hazard to motorists traveling Del Dios Highway. Such design attributes include a narrow steel utility pole located beyond an existing metal guard rail and an equipment vault located completely below grade. Due to these elements, the potential hazard to motorists is less than significant.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Correspondence from the Department of Planning and Land Use, Building Division confirmed that the project would meet fire code access and exceed FP-2 requirements. Additionally, public roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. Therefore, the project has adequate emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed telecommunication facility is unmanned, requiring two maintenance trips per month. There is space to park a maintenance vehicle along the shoulder of Del Dios Highway approximately 25 feet south of the proposed project. At this location, there is no guard rail. Therefore, the maintenance worker would be able to park along the shoulder and then walk behind the existing guard rail to access the site. As this space would meet the parking needs of the facility, the project would not result in an insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is an unmanned telecommunication facility. Its implementation would not result in construction of new road design features, nor present any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies regarding alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board or require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned telecommunication facility that would not result in wastewater discharge to sanitary sewer or on-site wastewater systems (septic). Therefore, the project would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements. Furthermore, the project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities or require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project would not require construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve the construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities. As a result, significant environmental effects would not occur from the construction of new or expanded facilities.

- c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project does not involve or require water services from a water district. The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility that does not rely on water service for any purpose.

- d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility that would not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility and would not generate solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any

landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant that would be potentially impacted by the project include Biological Resources, and specifically, approximately 0.10-acre impacts to coastal sage scrub. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces this impact to a level below significant. Mitigation for project impacts include: the offsite purchase of coastal sage scrub at a 3:1 ratio, temporary fencing along the Hardline Preserve, a biological monitor, and avoidance of avian breeding season. The proposed project may have significant impacts related to Cultural Resources, specifically, buried archaeological resources and human remains. Mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these potential impacts to a level below significant. Mitigation for project impacts include a pre-grade archaeological survey, construction boundary fencing, and implementation of a grading monitoring program by a qualified archaeologist. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of

a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Lake Hodges Dam #401	Minor Use Permit 02-061
Cielo Azul Estates	Tentative Map 5471
Shaw Santa Fe Valley	Specific Plan Amendment 03-002
San Diego River #402/Spring	Minor Use Permit 02-062
Koons TPM	Tentative Parcel Map 20521
Rancho Cielo TM	Tentative Map 5456

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to below a level of significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2.
(www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Merkel & Associates, Inc. SD06758 Del Dios highway, T-Mobile Wireless Project Biological Impact Analysis Report (County of San Diego Case #MUP06-072). June 18, 2008.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996.
(endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.
(migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>), (www.oes.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban

Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000.
(www.amlegal.com)

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq.
(www4.law.cornell.edu)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003.
(www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dplw2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994.
(www.sdcounty.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.
(www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997.
(www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.
(www.swrcb.ca.gov)

T-Mobile USA, Inc. Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) For Minor Projects. May 16, 2006

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001.
(ceres.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989.
(www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000.
(ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov) County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource
Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the
San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation
Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace,
Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
(BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for
Highway Projects.